



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,818	10/30/2000	Brian L. Ganz		7165
7590	06/07/2005		EXAMINER	
John R Ross III Ross Patent Law Office P O Box 2138 Del Mar, CA 92014			GORDON, BRIAN R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1743	

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/699,818	GANZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian R. Gordon	Art Unit 1743	

All Participants:

(1) Brian R. Gordon.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) John Ross.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 June 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-41

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed applicant that the received after final amendment (5/19/05) was incomplete in the system. Applicant explained the response was submitted in two separate transmissions. However, only one has been properly entered. The examiner requested a full copy of the transmission including transmittal letters and confirmation receipts of the original transmissions. The examiner also informed applicant that if all the claims were amended from apparatus claims to method claims the response would not be entered. However, the examiner explained that if applicant agreed to cancel all of the method claims the examiner would allow new apparatus claim 42 which includes previously indicated allowable subject matter, pending SPE approval. Applicant agreed to send full fax transmission and discuss the option of allowing claim 42 with applicant. .